

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of August 16, 2011, claims 6, 7, 10-19, 22-31 and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,459,442 B1 (hereinafter “Edwards et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,471,578 (hereinafter “Moran et al.”). Furthermore, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,184,885 B1 (hereinafter “DeStefano”).

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 6, 18 and 30 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Edwards et al. and Moran et al. As amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 6, 18 and 30 are not obvious over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims 6-8, 10-20, 22-31 and 33-40 be allowed.

1. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 6, 18 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements so that a functionality of said one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by said other element,*” which is not disclosed in Edwards et al. or Moran et al. Consequently, the amended independent claim 6 is not obvious over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 6 be allowed.

The Office Action correctly states on page 4 that Edwards et al. “does not teach wherein a first graphic element of said additional graphic elements is displayed in said

display-and-control graphic element and a second graphic element of said different graphic element is displayed outside of said display-and-control graphic element, and wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element.” Thus, Edwards et al. does not teach the limitation of “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements so that a functionality of said one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by said other element,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 6.

In addition, the cited reference of Moran et al. fails to teach the above limitation of the amended independent claim 6. In particular, the cited reference of Moran et al. fails to teach that the text “alter” in a freeform loop selection 70 and the text “ed” outside of the freeform loop selection 70 have a defined operational relationship such that one of the two texts is controlled by the other text so that a functionality of one of the text “alter” and the text “ed” is controlled by the other text. In fact, neither of the text “alter” and the text “ed” has any functionality that can be controlled. Thus, Moran et al. also does not teach the limitation of “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements so that a functionality of said one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by said other element,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 6.

Since neither Edwards et al. nor Moran et al. teaches the claimed limitation of “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element such that one of said first and second graphic*

elements is controlled by the other element of the said first and second graphic elements so that a functionality of said one of said first and second graphic elements is controlled by said other element,” the amended independent claim 6 cannot be rendered obvious over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that
5 the amended independent claim 6 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 18 and 30, which recite similar limitations as the amended independent claim 6. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 18 and 30 are also not obvious
10 over Edwards et al. in view of Moran et al., and requests that these amended independent claims 18 and 30 be allowed as well.

2. Patentability of Dependent Claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40

15 Each of the dependent claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40 depends on one of the amended independent claims 6, 18 and 30. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional
20 reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

25 Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

Date: August 16, 2011

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300